

FILED
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

11 OCT 11 AM 11:50

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

In The UNITED States District Court
FOR The District Of Nebraska

United States

Case No 09-CR-457

V

Motion For Reconsideration
OR AN ADVERSARIAL HEARING

Shannon Williams

UNDER Rule 51

Now Comes Shannon Williams AND moves this court
TO ADDRESS HIS MOTIONS DIRECTLY AND OBSERVE THE
ADVERSARIAL PROCESS.

THE COURT FOUND THAT SUSAN DEVETTER HAD COMPLIED
WITH 28 USC 753 (b) IN FULL, BY REVIEW OF ITS
OWN RECORDS. IT IS IMPOSSIBLE FOR THE COURT (THE
JUDICIAL BRANCH) TO REVIEW ANY RECORDS OF IT'S OWN
TO VERIFY THAT THE COURT REPORTER (SUSAN DEVETTER)
HAS COMPLIED WITH 28 USC 753(b). AS RELUCTANT AS THE
DEFENDANT IS TO ACCUSE THE COURT OF MALFEAENCE, THAT
FINDING IS NOT BASED ON ANY EVIDENCE. WHAT RECORDS HAS
THE COURT REVIEWED TO REFUTE THE DEFENDANT'S SIGNED
AFFIDAVIT THAT SUSAN DEVETTER HAS DELIBERATELY CHANGED
THE TRANSCRIPT TO BENEFIT THE GOVERNMENT? WHY IS THIS
COURT NOT ADDRESSING THE DEFENDANT'S MOTIONS?

MIKE Tasset filed A MOTION TO PRESERVE THE AUDIO
RECORDINGS, THE DEFENDANT FILED A MOTION TO
PRODUCE THE AUDIO FILES, BECAUSE OF DELIBERATE

CHANGES MADE FROM WHAT TRANSPRIED IN OPEN COURT AND THE TRANSCRIPT.

The CLERK OF THE COURT IS MANDATED BY THE LAW OF 28 USC 753 (B) TO KEEP THE RECORDS OF THE FILINGS BY COURT REPORTERS INCLUDING THE ORIGINAL RECORDS, SUSAN DEVETTER had not filed ANY OF the ORIGINAL RECORDS PRIOR TO MY COMPLAINTS TO ED CHAMPION ON September 29th 2011. The JAIL HAS THE RECORD OF THE AUDIO RECORDINGS OF THESE CONVERSATIONS. THE COURT CAN NOT CITE ANY TIME AND DATE STAMPED RECORDS OF SUSAN DEVETTER BY THE CLERK OF THE COURT BESIDES FILING 1001 THE TRANSCRIPTS. BUT AGAIN THAT IS ALMOST IRRELEVANT TO THE DEFENDANTS MOTION TO CORRECT THE TRANSCRIPT ...

The defendant HAS A VIVID RECOLLECTION OF THE COLLOQUIES AND TESTIMONY THAT WAS CHANGED DELIBERATELY WITH ILL WILL TO COVER-UP GROSS AND CRIMINAL MISCONDUCT BY THE GOVERNMENT ATTORNEYS, THE TRANSCRIPT IS WRONG.

WHY IS THE COURT ARBITRARILY CHOOSING TO IGNORE AND AVOID THE CRIMINAL MISBEHAVIOR OF THE COURT REPORTER, THE DEFENDANT SWEORE UNDER OATH WAS COMMITTED, BY CHANGING THE TRANSCRIPTS?

BY THE FEDERAL [REDACTED] RULE OF APPELLATE PROCEDURE THE COURT MUST RESOLVE THE DISCREPENCIES IN THE TRANSCRIPT. Filing 1051 The defendant asserted that the court reporter had engaged in a pattern of deliberately NOT TRANSCRIBING WHAT HAD TRANSPRIED IN OPEN COURT.

The court has inexplicably found that the court reporter complied with 28 USC 753(B) by review of its own records, WHAT RECORDS?...

SINCE THESE PROCEEDINGS ARE allegedly an adversarial process where in ITS records did the court find Ms. Devetter in [REDACTED] compliance with 28 USC 753(B). What did Ms. Devetter do to be in compliance? Moreover, the defendant would like to review the courts mysterious records to resolve the DELIBERATE discrepancies in the record.

THE DEFENDANT WANTS THE OPPORTUNITY TO MAKE A GOOD FAITH ATTEMPT TO CORRECT the TRANSCRIPT. NO SUCH RECORDS EXIST BESIDES THE AUDIO FILES AND THE TESTIMONY OF THE WITNESSES PRESENT TO RECREATE THE ACTUAL RECORDS, OF THE TESTIMONY. THE TRANSCRIPT DOES NOT REFLECT WHAT TRANSPRIED.

THE COURT LIKE ALL THOSE PRESENT KNOWS THE COURT REPORTER HAS DELIBERATELY CHANGED THE TRANSCRIPT OF WHAT HAPPENED IN OPEN COURT, AND IS NOT EVEN ATTEMPTING TO CORRECT THE TRANSCRIPTS

AS PRESCRIBED BY FED RULE APPELLATE PROCEDURE 10(E) (1) AND (2).

FUNDAMENTAL FAIRNESS IS BEING ABANDONED, DUE PROCESS IGNORED, FED.R. APP.P. CIRCUMVENTED, AND 28 USC 753 (B) VIOLATED WITH IMPUNITY, TO COVER GROSS MISCONDUCT BY THE GOVERNMENT AND THE COURTS SANCTIONING OF THESE BLATANT VIOLATIONS OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION.

THE DISTRICT COURT IS GOING BEYOND MERELY RUBBER-STAMPING THE GOVERNMENT'S EGREGIOUS MISCONDUCT TO ACTIVE PARTICIPATION, IF THE COURT IS GOING TO DENY DUE PROCESS OF A FULL AND FAIR HEARING ON THE TRANSCRIPT BEING DELIBERATELY CHANGED TO BENEFIT THE GOVERNMENT.

THAT IS THE MOST SERIOUS OF ALLEGATIONS, THAT IN ANY OTHER-PURSUIT OF JUSTICE- SETTING WOULD BE IMMEDIATELY ADDRESSED. THE DEFENDANT HAS SWORN TO EXACTLY WHERE THE OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT WAS CHANGED (PURPOSELY) TO THE PETITIONER'S DETRIMENT. YET THE DISTRICT COURT WILL NOT EVEN MENTION THE SPECIFIC CLAIMS OF THE TRANSCRIPT BEING CHANGED IN A MANNER TO OBSTRUCT JUSTICE WHICH IF TRUE WOULD BE A CRIMINAL VIOLATION OF THE FEDERAL STATUTE. The Court is DUTY BOUND TO HOLD EVERYONE INVOLVED IN A CRIMINAL PROSECUTION TO HIGH STANDARDS.

INCLUDING THE COURT REPORTER MS. SUSAN DEVETTER.

AT THE VERY LEAST THE DEFENDANT SHOULD BE ALLOWED TO PROVE HIS ALLEGATIONS. THE ADVERSARIAL PROCESS DEMANDS NO LESS THAN A FULL AND FAIR HEARING, ESPECIALLY IN LIGHT OF THE SPECIFIC ALLEGATIONS AND THE NON-REFUTABLE FACT THAT THE DISTRICT COURT ON ATLEAST FIVE DIFFERENT OCASSIONS VIOLATED THE PROVISIONS OF 28 USC 753 (b) BY ORDERING (OVER THE DEFENDANTS OBJECTIONS), OFF-THE-RECORD HEARINGS IN OPEN COURT. SEE TRIAL TRANSCRIPT AT PG 207:11 ; PG 89; 870:15-16 ; 915 ; The Rule IS MANSATORY. OF COURSE THE COURT REPORTER thought She could get away with changing the transcript, AFTER THE DISTRICT COURT KEPT ORDERING OFF-THE-RECORD HEARINGS IN OPEN COURT INCLUDING DISMISSING 3 JURORS AT ITS OWN WHIM WITHOUT STATING A REASON.

NOW THERE ARE ATLEAST 30-40 TIMES WHERE THE COURT REPORTER USES THE LINES -- TO REPRESENT SOMETHING INDECIPHERABLE, BUT IN WHICH THE TESTIMONY IS CRYSTAL CLEAR. THE COMPLETE TEXT HELPS THE DEFENSE, SO THE COURT REPORTER ACTS LIKE THE SPEAKER CANT BE HEARD THAT TAKES PLACE ON PAGE 87 AND 86 WHERE THE COURT TOLD THE JURY HE HAD ALREADY RULED THERE WAS NO ATTORNEY -

CLIENT RELATIONSHIP. PG 310:7; 733; 894:22-25;
The fake lines -- ARE USED TO HIDE THE COMPLETE
TESTIMONY, TOO MANY TIMES TO LIST, GOING BACK TO
THE DECEMBER HEARINGS ON PG 1610 AND 1728.

NOT ONE TIME DOES MS. DEVETTER THE DEFENSE
NOTES ASK THE WITNESSES TO CLARIFY THERE ANSWER.

The problem is THE -- IS ONLY USED TO HURT
the defendant the trial transcript is a total
fabrication when the court reporter is allowed
to omit testimony or deliberately change what
was said in its ENTIRETY. THE CORRECTNESS OF AN
OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT IS OF PARAMOUNT IMPORTANCE IN A
CRIMINAL PROCEEDING, NOT ONLY FOR THE DUE PROCESS
RIGHTS OF THE DEFENDANT, BUT AS A MATTER OF
PUBLIC TRUST IN THE JUDICIARY. Why is the court
OVERLY PROTECTIVE AND RELUCTANT TO ALLOW THE
TRUTH OF WHAT TRANSPRIRED IN OPEN COURT TO BE
ADJUDICATED THROUGH FULL EXPOSITION BY A
HEARING WITH THE AUDIO RECORDINGS OF THE
COURT REPORTER OR THE MARSHALL SERVICE?...

The defendant has made serious criminal
allegations against the official transcript released
and certified by ms. devetter. The allegations can
be EASILY SUBSTANTIATED OR REFUTED WITH THE

back-up media files, OR Audio/video security tapes.

The courts OPEN AVERSION TO REPUDIATING charges of collusion by the defendant AS IT RELATES TO DELIBERATELY CHANGING THE TRANSCRIPTS, IS BRINGING DISRESPECT ON THE JUDICIARY.

IN A CASE WHERE THE GOVERNMENT HAS BEEN ALLOWED TO PAY A PRIVATE ATTORNEY \$100,000 TO GATHER EVIDENCE IN HIS OFFICIAL CAPACITY BY PRACTICING DECEIT, ALLOWED THAT SAME ATTORNEY TO PRACTICE DECEIT TO EARN A PSEUDO-CLIENT A SENTENCE REDUCTION, ILLEGALLY WIRE THE ATTORNEY-CLIENT ROOMS, INEXPLICABLY, AND WITHOUT EXPLANATION LOSE THOSE ILLEGAL TAPES, REFUSE TO TURN OVER REPORTS OF WHEN AN ATTORNEY FIRST BECAME A PAID CONFIDENTIAL INFORMANT, INEXPLICABLY AND WITHOUT EXPLANATION LOSE SIX GOVERNMENT RECORDINGS, STEAL ATLEAST \$60,000 out of the defendants SAFE, NOT WRITE ONE REPORT OF THE SIX MONTHS OF THE INVESTIGATION, BLATANTLY LIE TO THE GRAND JURY, AND IN OPEN COURT CHANGE THE TESTIMONY OF ITS OWN WITNESS WHO TESTIFIED SHANNON WILLIAMS WAS NOT IN THE COURTROOM. WHEN THE GOVERNMENT ATTORNEYS AND ITS INVESTIGATORS GET AWAY WITH ATROCIOS VIOLETIONS

OF THE CONSTITUTION AS THOSE LISTED. OF COURSE THE GOVERNMENT WILL ENLIST THE COURT REPORTER TO CHANGE THE OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT.

If the court will not restrain the government from paying attorneys to lie about the performance of their duties and illegally wire the attorney-client rooms, then lose the tape recordings, changing the transcripts almost becomes common place.

The defendant is requesting the court protect the constitutional rights of the defendant and correct the transcript.

Wherefore the petitioner prays to be treated as a UNITED STATES CITIZEN WITH CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS.

Respectfully Submitted on Oct 5, 2011

SIGNED: Shannon Williams

Certificate of Service

I, Shannon Williams, give this to Don Schense to provide a copy to Susan Lehr.